DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 359 622 EA 025 055

AUTHOR Tuneberg, Jeffrey
TITLE Methods of Power Used by the Ohio State Department of Education To Implement State Mandated Programs.
PUB DATE 12 Apr 93
NOTE 13p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Atlanta, GA, April 12-16, 1993).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Change Strategies; Elementary Secondary Education; *Organizational Change; *Power Structure; *Program Implementation; Public Schools; School Districts; *State Departments of Education; State Legislation; *State School District Relationship; Superintendents
IDENTIFIERS *Ohio

ABSTRACT

Findings of a study that examined superintendents' perceptions of the methods used by the Ohio State Department of Education to implement legislative mandates are presented in this paper. Etzioni's compliance theory is used as a framework to understand superintendents' perceptions about the state's use of power. A survey of 205 Ohio public school superintendents produced 158 responses, a 77 percent response rate. Overall, superintendents viewed expert power and information power as highly utilized methods of power. Rural superintendents relied more heavily on information power than did their urban counterparts. Urban respondents saw greater evidence of the use of reward power, although both urban and rural superintendents perceived it as a secondary method. Finally, the state Department of Education used each of the three types of power methods--normative, remunerative, and coercive. However, the use of coercive power is incongruous with the needs of normative organizations. It is recommended that the state department act as advocate for the individual school districts and encourage local school personnel to work cooperatively toward statewide goals; and that the chief state school officer and governor achieve a unified stance. Ten tables are included. (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED359622

Methods of Power Used by the Ohio State Department of Education to Implement State Mandated Programs

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Tuneberg

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

A paper presented at the American Educational Research Association's Annual Meeting, Atlanta, Georgia, April 12-16, 1993.

Jeffrey Tuneberg, Ph.D.
Curriculum Coordinator
Mercer County (OH) Office of Education
311 South Main Street
Celina, Ohio 45822
(419) 586-6628

EA 025 055

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Methods of Power Used by the Ohio State Department of Education to Implement State Mandated Programs

Jeffrey Tuneberg, Ph.D.
Curriculum Coordinator
Mercer County (OH) Office of Education
311 S. Main Street
Celina, Ohio 45822
(419) 586-6628

The purpose of this study was to determine superintendents' perceptions of the methods by which the Ohio State Department of Education influences Ohio's public school districts. This study was designed to answer practical questions about the influence and control the state department of education utilized while implementing legislative mandates. In addition, this study examines the relative importance of these criteria as perceived by public school superintendents in urban, suburban, and rural school districts in Ohio. Results were then analyzed to determine if the superintendents' perceptions of the state's use of power were consistent with those recommended by Etzioni's Compliance Theory (1975).

Etzioni categorized organizations based on the dominant compliance mode. More directly, Etzioni investigated the relationship between superordinates' power use in organizations and subordinates' perceptions and responses. He theorized that compliance patterns in organizations result from an interaction of the dominant type of power used and the subordinates' dominant type of involvement. Specifically, Etzioni postulated that the use of coercive control is congruent with alienative involvement (hostile), that remunerative means of control are consistent with calculative involvement (neutral feelings, material benefit), and that normative control is associated with moral involvement (strong beliefs and values about the organization).

Because schools, like religious and political organizations, are normative organizations, Etzioni argued that the use of certain types of power, such as coercion, may be considered incongruent with the psychological disposition of teachers and administrators and thus have significant negative consequences. Failure to use "appropriate" types of power within the context of the subordinate's perspective leads to negative outcomes at the individual level (employee resentment, low morale, alienation), and to instability at the organizational level (Cusick, 1983; Lortie, 1975; Wynne, 1987). Schools are normative in character and it is

important to recognize the importance of certain values (equity, fairness) in relation to understanding teachers, administrators, and their responses to each other (Cusick, 1983; Dreeben, 1968; Blase, 1988).

Etzioni offered a framework for securing subordinate compliance that suggests the administrator has three possible types of power and that there are predictible relationships between the type exercised and the subordinate reaction and other organizational variables.

Data for the study were gathered by mailing a copy of the Power Perception Profile: Perception of Other to the selected superintendents. A stratified random selection of 205 Ohio public school superintendents was assessed with a survey instrument to which 158 superintendents responded, resulting in a 77 percent return rate. Data collected reflects the superintendents' perceptions of the power methods utilized by the Ohio State Department of Education. The Power Perception Profile: Perception of Other classifies power into the following seven categories: coercive, reward, information, expert, connection, legitimate, and referent power. The format consists of twenty-one pairs of forced choice statements in which the participant rates the leader on a three point scale for each pair of statements. The participant allocates three points between the two alternative choices in each pair, based on the relative importance of each alternative.

Expert power was identified as the most frequently used power method. Information power was also identified as very frequently utilized, and coercive power and legitimate power were identified as frequently occuring. Reward power, referent power, and connection power were cited as being utilized less frequently (see Table 1).

When compared across school district type (urban, suburban, rural), consistency of responses was high. However, differences were noted in the use of information power and reward power (see Table 2). Rural district superintendents' perceptions indicated a greater use of information power by the state department of education than did superintendents of urban districts (see Tables 3 and 4). Additionally, superintendents of urban districts perceived the state department of education as using a higher degree of reward power than did superintendents of either suburban or rural districts (see Tables 5 and 6).

When results were compared to the descriptions of Etzioni's Compliance Theory, a variety of power methods was utilized from each of the three power types (normative, remunerative, and coercive). Normative power was utilized by the state department of education as Etzioni's Compliance Theory describes. However, remunerative and coercive power methods were also identified as frequently utilized. This would not be consistent with the descriptions of Etzioni's Compliance Theory (see Table 7).

Results were consistent when responses were compared across districts categorized by superintendents' experience and district per pupil expenditure. When districts were compared relative to superintendents' age, a high degree of consistency again appeared (see Table 8). However, superintendents in the 50 and over age category ranked reward power higher than did superintendents in the 41-49 age category (see Tables 9 and 10).

Based on the analysis of the findings of this study, several conclusions can be drawn.

1. It would appear that there is a high degree of consistency among school district superintendents' perceptions of the power methods employed by the state department of education. Superintendents viewed expert power and information power as highly utilized power methods.

2. Superintendents from various district types (urban, suburban, rural) again agree on the utilized power methods. However, rural district superintendents' perceptions indicated a greater reliance on information power than did superintendents of urban districts. This may be due in part to the ability of urban districts to employ administrative personnel to interpret and disseminate information from the state department of education, while rural districts, with smaller adminstrative staffs, may rely more heavily on state level consultants and supervisors.

3. Although reward power was perceived by all superintendents to be a secondary means of control, superintendents of urban districts perceived the state department of education as using a higher degree of reward power than did the superintendents of either suburban or rural districts. This perception may be due in part to the relative inexperience of superintendents employed by urban districts, who may be motiviated by the prestige, commendations, and financial links associated with reward power. Urban districts tended to employ a higher percentage of superintendents in the early stages of their career than did suburban or rural school districts.

4. Results indicated that the state department of education utilized power methods from each of the three power types (normative, remunerative, and coercive). While normative power and the limited use of remunerative power would be consistent with the normative nature of school district organization, the use of coercive power, as perceived by a large number of superintendents, is incongruous with the needs of a majority of normative organizations.

Implications resulting from the study are as follows:

1. The state department of education should strive to serve as an advocate for the individual school districts. Assistance teams should be utilized to provide support for those districts whose students perform below minimum standards, as well as to provide assistance to districts who wish to implement innovative and/or experimental programs.

2. Local school people should be encouraged to work cooperatively toward similar goals. This could be accomplished through unified efforts in state sponsored agendas and regionalization of some grant-funded programs.

3. A unified stance should be presented by the Chief State School Officer and the Governor. This alliance will help to bond the needs of local school people with those legislators whose bills and legislative mandates drive many of the education reform movements present in schools.

References:

Blase, J. (1988). Dimensions of effective school leadership: The teacher's perspective. The Journal of Educational Administration, 24(2), 193-213.

Cusick, P. A. (1983). The egalitarian ideal and the American high school: Studies of three schools. London: Longman.

Dreeben, R. (1968). On what is learned at school. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Etzioni, A. (1975). A comparative analysis of complex organizations (rev. ed.). New York: MacMillan, Free Press.

Lortie, D. C. (1975). Schoolteacher: A sociological study. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Wynne, E. A. (1987, April). Schools as morally governed institutions. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington DC.

Table 1: An Analysis of Rank Order of State-Used Power Methods as Perceived by Superintendents

Rank	Power Method	Urban	Suburban	Rural
1	Expert	1	1	2
2	Information	2	2	1
3	Coercive	3	3	3
4	Legitimate	5	4	4
5	Reward	4	6	6
6	Referent	6	5	5
7	Connection	7	7	7

Spearman Rho:

Urban vs. Suburban = .89
Urban vs. Rural = .86
Suburban vs. Rural = .96

Table 2: Means, Standard Deviations, and F-ratios for Three Groups of Superintendents on Each of Seven Types of Power Used by the State Department of Education

Power	Total N=158		Urban N=42		Suburban N=53		Rural N=63	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Coercive	9.709	3.341	9.857	2.581	9.830	3.507	9.508	3.671
Connection	6.000	2.851	6.000	2.776	5.623	2.339	6.317	3.267
Expert	11.013	2.822	10.762	2.377	11.000	2.710	11.190	3.192
Information	10.873	2.015	10.048	1.545	10.830	1.949	11.460	2.169
Legitimate	9.304	3.440	9.238	3.773	9.453	3.035	9.222	3.576
Referent	7.886	3.016	7.429	3.163	8.385	2.836	7.794	3.054
Reward	8.114	2.346	9.667	2.008	7.906	1.746	7.254	2.508

Table 2 (cont.)

Power	F-ratio	p*
Coercive	.188	.8286
Connection	.853	.4280
Expert	.289	.7495
Information	6.659	.0017*
Legitimate	.074	.9285
Referent	1.166	.3145
Reward	16.303	.0001*

* any p-value of .05 or less is considered significant

Table 3: ANOVA Summary Table for the Three Groups of Superintendents on State Use of Information Power

Source	df	Sum Squares	Mean Square	F
Between Groups	2	50.441	25.221	6.659
Within Groups	155	587.027	3.787	p=.0017*
Total	157	637.468		

* any p-value of .05 or less is considered significant

Table 4: Post Hoc Comparison of Superintendent Groups on State Use of Information Power

Group	Mean Comparison	Mean Difference	Scheffe F
Urban vs. Suburban	10.048 vs. 10.830	-.783	1.894
Urban vs. Rural	10.048 vs. 11.460	-1.413	6.640*
Suburban vs. Rural	10.830 vs. 11.460	-.630	1.509

* significant at .05

Table 5: ANOVA Summary Table for the Three Groups of Superintendents on State Use of Reward Power

Source	df	Sum Squares	Mean Square	F
Between Groups	2	150.151	75.076	16.303
Within Groups	155	713.798	4.605	p=.0001*
Total	157	863.949		

* any p-value of .05 or less is considered significant

Table 6: Post Hoc Comparison of Superintendent Groups on State Use of Reward Power

Group	Mean Comparison	Mean Difference	Scheffe F
Urban vs. Suburban	9.667 vs. 7.906	1.761	7.890*
Urban vs. Rural	9.667 vs. 7.254	2.413	15.927*
Suburban vs. Rural	7.906 vs. 7.254	.652	1.327

* significant at .05

Table 7: Power Methods Means and Frequencies

Power Method	Mean	Status	Power Type
Expert	11.013	Very Frequently Occurring	Normative
Information	10.873	Very Frequently Occurring	Remunerative
Coercive	9.709	Frequently Occurring	Coercive
Legitimate	9.304	Frequently Occurring	Coercive
Average	8.986	----------	---------
Reward	8.114	Not Frequently Occurring	Remunerative
Referent	7.886	Not Frequently Occurring	Normative
Connection	6.000	Very Infrequently Occurring	Coercive

Table 8: Means and F-ratios for Three Age Groups of Superintendents on Each of Seven Types of Power Used by the State

Power	Total M	40 and under	41-49	50 and over	F-ratio	p*
Coercive	9.709	8.667	9.667	9.893	.381	.6835
Connection	6.000	8.333	5.833	6.036	2.212	.1130
Expert	11.013	10.667	11.292	10.571	1.202	.3033
Information	10.873	10.333	10.688	11.250	1.615	.2023
Legitimate	9.304	9.667	9.542	8.857	.733	.4823
Referent	7.886	6.667	8.083	7.679	.827	.4395
Reward	8.114	8.667	7.688	8.786	4.215	.0165*

* any p-value of .05 or less is considered significant

Table 9: ANOVA Summary Table for the Three Age Groups of Superintendents on State Use of Reward Power

Source	df	Sum Squares	Mean Square	F
Between Groups	2	44.562	22.281	4.215
Within Groups	155	819.387	5.286	p=.0165*
Total	157	863.949		

* any p-value of .05 or less is considered significant

Table 10: Post Hoc Comparison of Superintendent Age Groups on State Use of Reward Power

Group	Mean Comparison	Mean Difference	Scheffe F
40 and under vs. 41-49	8.667 vs. 7.688	.979	.512
40 and under vs. 50 and over	8.667 vs. 8.786	-.119	.007
41-49 vs. 50 and over	7.688 vs. 8.786	-1.098	4.035*

* significant at .05